



# United States Patent and Trademark Office



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/888,882	06/25/2001	David K. Mesecher	1-2-105.1US	1182
24374 75	590 12/29/2004		EXAMINER	
VOLPE AND	KOENIG, P.C.		LY, NO	ЭНІ Н
DEPT. ICC	ZA, SUITE 1600		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
30 SOUTH 17T	TH STREET		2686	
PHILADELPH	IA, PA 19103		DATE MAILED: 12/29/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



<u> </u>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	- ()
		MESECHER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	09/888,882 Examiner	Art Unit	
omoo noden cammary	Nghi H. Ly	2686	
The MAILING DATE of this communication			
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Country after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days,  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory properties to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON.  FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may on.  a reply within the statutory minimum of period will apply and will expire SIX (6) No statute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. IONTHS from the mailing date of this communical ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.
Status			
	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice un	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		s is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 8 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction at Application Papers	hdrawn from consideration.	*	
_			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa		to by the Examiner	
Applicant may not request that any objection to			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the country.  The oath or declaration is objected to by the	orrection is required if the drawi	ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International B * See the attached detailed Office action for	ments have been received. ments have been received in priority documents have be ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No en received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-943) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/02/04.	Paper f	w Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/888,882

Art Unit: 2686

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Objections

1. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claim 7, page 22, line 3, the word "coplaner" should be changed to "coplanar". Appropriate correction is required.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cavelos et al (US 6,121,914) in view of Smith et al (US 5,949,370).

Application/Control Number: 09/888,882

Art Unit: 2686

Regarding claim 7, Cavelos teaches a method for interference cancellation for use in conjunction with a base station having a main antenna (see fig.3 and column 2, line 57 to column 3, line 9) for receiving signals from a plurality of remote users (see column 2, lines 57-64, "signal inputs"), wherein at least one interference source is known (see column 3, lines 10-17, the teaching of Cavelos inherently teaches this claimed limitation), comprising the steps of: directing at least one directional antenna toward the at least one interference source (see column 3, lines 10-17, the teaching of Cavelos inherently teaches this claimed limitation) and canceling an interference signal generated by the at least one known interference source (see column 1, lines 9-14 and column 3, lines 10-17).

Cavelos does not specifically disclose each directional antenna having a plurality coplanar feeds that are located one quarter to one half wavelength apart from each other, each coplaner feed for receiving an RF signal.

Smith teaches each directional antenna having a plurality coplanar feeds that are located one quarter to one half wavelength apart from each other, each coplanar feed for receiving an RF signal (see fig.2, items 22 and column 5, lines 53-59. The teaching of Smith inherently teaches this claimed limitation since Smith teaches that "the <u>specific</u> location of the fees 22 is a matter of choice in the design").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Smith into the system of Calvelos in order to adjust the beam configuration by use of a feed network.

Application/Control Number: 09/888,882

Art Unit: 2686

# Allowable Subject Matter

#### 5. Claims 1-6 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 1, Cavelos teaches an interference cancellation system for use in conjunction with a base station having a main antenna for receiving signals from a plurality of remote users, wherein at least one interference source is known, the system comprising: at least one directional antenna directed toward the at least one interference source (see fig.3 and column 2, line 57 to column 3, line 9).

Smith teaches the antenna having a plurality of coplanar feeds that are located one quarter to one half wavelength apart from each other, each coplanar feed for receiving an RF signal (see fig.2, items 22 and column 5, lines 53-59).

Cavelos and Smith, alone or in combination, fails to teaches weighting the RF signals received by the plurality of coplanar feeds to produce a cancellation signal, first summing means for summing the weighted signals using a least mean square (LMS) algorithm, and second summing means for summing the cancellation signal with signals received from the main antenna to produce an output signal substantially free from interference.

Dependent claims 2-6 are allowable for the same reason.

Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2686

Claim 8 is objected for the reasons as stated in the previous Office action (dated 0725/2004) page 5.

#### Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi H. Ly whose telephone number is (703) 605-5164. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-5:30 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (703) 305-4379. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nghi H. Ly

(dly 12/24/04